

Application No. 09/702,505
Amendment "II" dated September 2, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed July 8, 2003

REMARKS

Applicant and applicant's attorney express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on August 7, 2003. The amendments and remarks made herein are consistent with the proposals and remarks presented during the interview. Reconsideration and allowance for the above-identified application are now respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, dated August 8, 2003, claims 1-7 and 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement, claims 17, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Perlman (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,909), and claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of Ranganathan (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,201). It will also be noted with appreciation that claims 21-27 were found allowable. Accordingly, the claims that remain at issue in this case are claims 1-7 and 9-20, of which only claims 1, 10, 17 are independent claims.

As discussed during the interview, claim 1 is directed to a method for compositing an image in such a way as to help reduce processing requirements for processing data that will not be visible during display of the image. The recited method includes dividing an image into a plurality of slices, corresponding lines and spans, and for each span, reading data from an image source without using a double image buffer. The portions of the image that are opaque and translucent are then identified. For each portion of the image that is translucent, the data from the image source(s) is read, blended and displayed. For each portion of the image that is opaque and that would be visible during display of the image, the visible image data is read, and without reading data that would not be visible. Claim 10 is directed to another method for compositing an image in which the image data is read and displayed from the one or more image sources and without storing a composite image of the data in a double image buffer.

Claims 7 and 10 were initially rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, for containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s), at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

By this paper, and as discussed during the interview, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to more clearly recite the claim embodiments in such a way as to rely on subject matter that is both described in the specification and that reflects the claimed invention was indeed possessed

Application No. 09/702,505
Amendment "B" dated September 2, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed July 8, 2003

by the inventors at the time the application was filed.¹ In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite how it is the image data corresponding to the translucent portions of the image that are read and blended, whereas only the image data that would be visible within the opaque portions are read, so as to correspond more closely with the disclosed embodiments of the specification.

Claim 10 has also been amended to clarify that the reading of the data is performed without storing a composite image of the data in a double image buffer. Because these claim amendments clarify the claimed embodiments, so that they rely on disclosed embodiments from the specification, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 10, along with the corresponding dependent claims, should now be found in condition for prompt allowance.

The last independent claim at issue is claim 17. Claim 17 is directed to a method for reducing flicker of a displayed image by blending span data. In particular, image data that is subject to flickering and that is defined by a single span from a line is blended with the span data from the corresponding vertically adjacent spans (e.g., the previous and next spans), and without blending the entire lines from which the vertically adjacent spans are obtained.

As discussed during the interview, amended claim 17 is neither anticipated by nor made obvious by Perlman, either singly or in combination with the other art of record. Perlman is generally directed to methods for reducing flicker through the use of tags that are attached to images and that reflect whether the images are subject to flicker, so as to avoid applying anti-flicker techniques to all images. (Abstract) Although Perlman identifies several anti-flicker techniques (e.g., 1-2-1, 1-3-1, 1-4-1, etc.), Perlman fails to teach of any method or system for reducing image flicker, except through the blending of entire lines. (Col. 6, ll. 10-20).

It will be appreciated that Perlman's disclosure corresponding to blending entire lines of an image is distinguished from the claimed blending of only specific spans. In fact, claim 17 by itself explicitly distinguishes from Perlman by stating that the blending of the vertically adjacent spans is performed "without blending the entire line, previous line and next line."

Ranganathan, which is used to reject dependent claim 19, also fails to teach of reducing flickering by blending span data. In fact, Ranganathan fails to disclose any method at all for

¹ Support for the amendments to claim 1 is drawn primarily from page 6, line 19 thru page 7, line 2; and page 16, lines 6-12. Support for amendments to claim 10 is drawn from page 6, lines 2-12; page 17, lines 1-3; and page 18, line 23 thru page 19, line 19.

Application No. 09/702,505
Amendment "B" dated September 2, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed July 8, 2003

reducing flickering². Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 and the corresponding dependent claims 18 and 19 are neither anticipated by nor made obvious by the art of record.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7 and 9-27 are in condition for prompt allowance. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 2nd day of September 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

RDN:JCJ
W:\1453\174\DM5000004712V001.DOC

² Instead, Ranganathan is directed to a graphics controller that can be used to display images at both CRT and LCD displays. (Abstract) The only reference made to flicker in Ranganathan is the following "CRT manufacturers design for a higher refresh rate of 75 or 85 Hz, which reduces flicker and meets ergonomic standards." Col. 2, ll. 66-67.